

**Appl. No.** : **10/081,028**  
**Filed** : **February 21, 2002**

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 and 15-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the Schweitzer reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,203,659), the Hiroki reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,989,346) the Somekh et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,697,748) or some combination thereof. By this paper, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6 and 15 to highlight the subject matter the Applicant believes is allowable over the art of record. Hence, reconsideration of the above-captioned application in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein is now respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 6 and 15 as being unpatentable over Schweitzer in view of Hiroki. However, after carefully reviewing the Schweitzer and Hiroki references, the Applicant notes that neither of these references either by themselves or in combination disclose a system that has two clamping devices suitable for simultaneously depositing and removing two chip carriers from a magazine in combination with a transport mechanism with an associated controller that moves the clamping mechanism in generally a first, single dimension, direction that is parallel to an extension arm that couples the transport mechanism to a base (*See, e.g.*, Claim 1 as amended). Schweitzer does not disclose the clamping mechanism being disposed above one another in a vertical arrangement and Hiroki illustrates that the clamping mechanism is not moveable in a single dimension along the direction of the extension arm, rather Hiroki is rotatable about multiple axis of rotation.

As such, even the combination of Schweitzer and Hiroki will still not result in the Applicant's invention as claimed. Moreover, any combination of Schweitzer and Hiroki would result in a substantially more complex system than the system defined by the amended claims of the present application. Hence, the Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Moreover, the Applicant, by this paper, has also amended Claims 6 and 15 to incorporate limitations similar to the limitations discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Appl. No. : 10/081,028  
Filed : February 21, 2002

### SUMMARY

Consequently, the Applicant submits that Claims 1, 6, and 15 are allowable over the art of record. The Applicant further submits that the remaining claims define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable due to their respective dependencies on Claims 1, 6 and 15. The Applicant therefore believes that the above-captioned application is in condition for allowance and requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to the prompt allowance of this application that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 3/6/08

By:

Michael H. Trenholm  
Registration No. 37,743  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(951) 781-9231

2420370:IW  
030606